



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/528,079	03/17/2005	Anders Wallenbeck	050159-0040	6550
20277 7590 01/22/2009 MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP 600 13TH STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3096				
EXAMINER				
TOOMER, CEPHIA D				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1797				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/22/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/528,079

Applicant(s)

WALLENBECK ET AL.

Examiner

Cephia D. Toomer

Art Unit

1797

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 October 2008.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 10-13 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SG/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 03/17/05
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I, claims 1-9 in the reply filed on October 24, 2008 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that it would not be a burden to examine claims 10-13 since they are directed to a process used to manufacture the product of claims 1-9. This is not found persuasive because the additive as claimed in Group I does not required the process steps of Group II. The prior art teaches that the additive may be prepared by a process other than that of Group II.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 4-9 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from another multiple dependent claim either directly or indirectly. See MPEP § 608.01(n).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 4-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 is rejected because the terms "low density", "low molecular weight" and "high molecular weight" are indefinite. The terms "low" and "high" are relative terms that do not have a comparative value. Also, "0,1" should read --0.1--.

Regarding claim 8, the phrase "preferably" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Claim 9 is rejected because the terms "low molecular weight" are indefinite. The term "low" is a relative term that does not have a comparative value.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng (US 4,229,309).

Cheng teaches a stable fluid magnesium containing dispersion and the preparation thereof in a dispersant containing fluid (see abstract). Cheng teaches that the composition may be used as a corrosion inhibitor in fuels containing vanadium (see col. 5, lines 28-29) when used in an amount from 1-2000 ppm (see col. 6, lines 24-29). In the process, $Mg(OH)_2$ is disintegrated into minute particles of MgO which are immediately suspended and become stabilized in the fluid by the presence of a

dispersing agent (see col. 1, lines 49-52). The process fluids may be mineral oils, paraffin oils, vegetable oil or mixtures (see col. 2, lines 1-5). The dispersant may be nonionic, anionic or amphoteric (see col. 2, lines 12-19). The particle size of the resulting MgO is no greater than about 5 microns (see col. 2, lines 28-32). The fluid contains from 1-32% when calculated as percent magnesium of the MgO particles (see col. 2, lines 33-40). Cheng teaches the limitations of the claims other than the differences that are discussed below.

Cheng fails to teach that the MgO particles have a crystalline low density structure of at most 2.0 g/cm^3 or that the metal is capable of forming vanadate having a melting point of 650-2000 C. However, since Cheng teaches the same compound as that of the present claims it would be reasonable to expect that the particles of Cheng would have similar properties.

Cheng does not teach the specific vegetable oils of claim 6 or diesel fuel of claim 7. However, Cheng's generic teaching of vegetable oils encompasses those of the present invention. With respect to the diesel fuel, Cheng teaches any relatively stable and relatively non-volatile fluid may be used (see col. 1, lines 62-68). This teaching suggests diesel fuel.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cephia D. Toomer whose telephone number is 571-272-1126. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Caldarola can be reached on 571-272-1444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Cephia D. Toomer/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1797

10528079\20090121